



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/477,389	01/04/2000	Andrew Ramsay Knox	UK9-99-004	9176

25299 7590 11/20/2002

IBM CORPORATION
PO BOX 12195
DEPT 9CCA, BLDG 002
RESEARCH TRIANGLE PARK, NC 27709

EXAMINER

LIN, KENNY S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2154

DATE MAILED: 11/20/2002

7

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/477,389	Applicant(s) KNOX ET AL. SK	
	Examiner Kenny Lin	Art Unit 2154	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 July 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final. ✓
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) <u>2</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-12 are presented for examination.
2. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed. The current title does not clearly indicate the invention. Applicant is suggested to change the title to "Wireless Connection for Portable Systems and Network Adapters using Wake-up Requests".

Specification

3. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:
 - a. U.S. Patent Number 4997494 listed on page 2 line 24 is titled "Chemically gassed emulsion explosive". This prior art shows no relativity to the current invention. Possible typing errors could have been made with the patent numbers.
 - b. U.S. Patent Number 55513359 listed on page 2, line 24 does not exist. Examiner has noticed the typing error and the patent number should be corrected as 5513359.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person

Art Unit: 2154

having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1, 5-7 and 11-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jackson et al, U.S. Patent Number 6,052,779.
6. As per claims 1 and 7, Jackson et al taught the invention substantially as claimed including a client computer system, suitable for connection to a data processing network having a controlling system, the controlling system being operable to issue a wake-up request to the client computer system, the wake-up request being issued by means of a wireless connection between the controlling system and the client computer system, the client computer system, on receipt of the wake-up request, powering on so as to allow normal operation of the client computer system (col.2, lines 3-12). Furthermore, as per claim 7, Jackson et al taught a wireless network adapter for use in a client computer system (col.8, lines 22-31).
7. Jackson et al did not specifically teach that the wake-up request is issued by means of a wireless connection between the controlling system and the client computer system. However, Jackson et al did mention that the connection between the controlling system and the client computer system could be of other arrangement (col.3, lines 16-19). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to replace the network to wireless connections, such as wireless LAN, to Jackson et al's system to enable communications to the client computer system when no physical network connection is available.

Art Unit: 2154

8. As per claims 5 and 11, Jackson et al taught the invention substantially as claimed in claims 1 and 7 including that the wake-up request is a Wake-on-LAN frame and the client computer system includes a network interface card operable, on receipt of a Wake-on-LAN frame, to power-on the client computer system (col.4, lines 27-36, 47-65).

9. As per claims 6 and 12, Jackson et al taught the invention substantially as claimed in claims 1 and 7 including that the controlling system is operable to issue a request to the client computer system to cease functioning, the client system comprising means for disabling the client computer system from further operation (col.1, lines 21-40).

10. Claims 2 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jackson et al, U.S. Patent Number 6,052,779, as applied to claims 1 and 7 above, and further in view of McCain et al, U.S. Patent Number 6,052,779.

11. As per claims 2 and 8, Jackson et al taught the invention substantially as claimed in claims 1 and 7. Jackson et al did not specifically teach that the wireless connection between the controlling system and the client computer system is a satellite data link. McCain et al taught a data communication system to use satellite data link to provide data interchange (col.1, lines 42-44, col.2, lines 16-20, 52-55). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Jackson et al and McCain et al because McCain et al's teaching of using satellite data link as the wireless connection would provide a network control function for all devices in Jackson et al's system.

12. Claims 3-4 and 9-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jackson et al, U.S. Patent Number 6,052,779, as applied to claims 1 and 7 above, and further in view of Spicer, U.S. Patent Number 6,097,760.

13. As per claims 3 and 9, Jackson et al taught the invention substantially as claimed in claims 1 and 7. Jackson et al did not specifically teach that the wireless connection between the controlling system and the client computer system is a DECT link. Spicer taught a data communication system using a DECT link as the wireless connection between the controlling system and the client computer system (col.1, lines 51-58, col.2, lines 12-14, 57-63, col.3, lines 61-65). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Jackson et al and Spicer because Spicer's teaching of using DECT link as the wireless connection enables Jackson et al's system for use in a radio in a local loop system.

14. As per claims 4 and 10, Jackson et al and Spicer taught the invention substantially as claimed in claims 3 and 9. Spicer further taught that the client computer system also provides a voice link simultaneously with a data link, the voice link and the data link using a single DECT link (col.3, lines 61-65, col.4, lines 28-47).

Conclusion

15. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Lim et al, U.S. Patent Number 5,974,552, disclosed wake-up request.

Cromer et al, U.S. Patent Number 6,304,899, disclosed wake-up request using a wireless signal.

Mores, U.S. Patent Number 6,148,409, disclosed a data transmission system.

Hiett, U.S. Patent Number 6,477,152, disclosed satellite data communication system.

What is DECT? Some answers..., DECTWEB, disclosed DECT history.

16. A shortened statutory period for reply to this Office action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action.

17. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kenny Lin whose telephone number is (703)305-0438. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 AM to 5 PM Tuesday to Friday and every other Monday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Meng-Ai An can be reached on (703)305-9678. Additionally, the fax numbers for Group 2100 are as follows:

Official Responses: (703) 746-7239

After Final Responses: (703) 746-7238

Draft Responses: (703) 746-7240

Application/Control Number: 09/477,389


Pa

Art Unit: 2154

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)305-5140.

ksl

November 7, 2002


ZARNI MAUNG
PRIMARY EXAMINER